

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

	APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/479,979			01/10/2000	WILLIAM HILL	13237-1701/M	3757	
	28319	7590	03/26/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER	
	BANNER & WITCOFF LTD., ATTORNEYS FOR MICROSOFT				HUYNH, CONG LAC T		
	1001 G STREET, N.W.				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	ELEVENT	LEVENTH STREET ASHINGTON DC 20001-4597			2178	20	

DATE MAILED: 03/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

7

2	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/479,979	HILL ET AL.				
,, ,	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Cong-Lac Huynh	2178				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
THE REPLY FILED 03 March 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a sinal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.						
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]					
 a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The ee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of 	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing in FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CFI fextension and the corresponding amo	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension unt of the fee. The appropriate extension				
ee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of 2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Officinely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	ce later than three months after the mail FR 1.704(b).	ling date of the final rejection, even if				
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF 	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal o					
The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:					
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the				
(d) they present additional claims without canceli	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.				
NOTE:						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):					
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment				
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: Se		dered but does NOT place the				
 The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection. 	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:	·					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>35-53</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ appl	roved or b) disapproved by t	he Examiner.				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)					
10. Other:		Atent				
		STEPHEN S. HONG PRIMARY EXAMINER				

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03)



Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants arguments are not persuasive. Applicants argue that Carliner does not disclose selecting one of a plurality of style sheets based upon the set of capabilities of the output device and the combination of Carliner and Spyglass is not proper. Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Carliner discloses the style for computer-delivered information wherein the format or the style of the delivered information depends on the physical characteristics of the output device (page 39). Carliner, therefore, suggests selecting one of the style based upon the capabilities of the output device since depending on the output device, the format of the output document would be different. Spyglass discloses determining a set of capabilities of the output device, and formatting the document for presentation on the output device, but not selecting the style based on the set of capabilities of the output device. Carliner, thus, would provide the advantage to have a selection option for an appropriate style for a document based on different output devices instead of merely formatting a document by converting the document style to a format of an identified device as in Spyglass.